

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 9-18, 20-24, 27-42, 44-46, 48-50, 52 and 53 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 14-16 and 18 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-6, 9-13, 27-42, 44, 45, 49, 50 and 52 contain allowable subject matter.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Grainger at the interview held July 7, 2009 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Claims 14-18 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims were rejected because they previously recited a processing device that includes a developing roller but the developing roller was previously recited in claim 46, from which claims 14-18 and 20-24 depend. Claims 14-16 and 18 have been amended responsive to the rejection.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14-18, 20-24, 46 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Kanno et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,681,088. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 46 recites a first elastic element transformable between a first original shape and a first transformed shape, wherein the first elastic element is attached to the photosensitive body and to the cartridge frame. As agreed during the personal interview, Kanno fails to teach or suggest these features.

As discussed during the personal interview, Kanno teaches springs 54 and 90, but neither of these springs is attached to a photosensitive body. Specifically, Kanno states "an elastic member (spring 54, 90) for applying an elastic force between the first frame and the second frame to urge the developing member to the photosensitive drum." (See Kanno at col. 9, lines 31-34.)

Nothing in Kanno can reasonably be interpreted as teaching or suggesting a first elastic element attached to a photo sensitive body.

Claims 14-18, 20-24 and 53 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 46, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kanno in view of Higeta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,311,026. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Kanno fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 46. Further, Higeta fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kanno. Thus, claim 48 is patentable by reason of its dependency from independent claim 46, as well as for the additional features it recites.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/sld

Date: July 15, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--